

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET**SUBJECT:** (Optional)**FROM:**

Director of Training and
Education
1026 Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION**NO.****DATE**

18 December 1987

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)**DATE****RECEIVED****FORWARDED****OFFICER'S
INITIALS****COMMENTS** (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. Deputy Director of
Central Intelligence
7E12 Headquarters

2.

3. Associate Deputy Director
for Intelligence
7E47 Headquarters

4.

5. Deputy Director for
Administration
7D18 Headquarters

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Attached FYI

December 9, 1987

PAGE TWO

The Harvard Crimson



The University Daily Since 1873

CIA and the K-School

An Imperfect Union

THE CIA and the K-School are two very different institutions with one thing in common. Although both were founded with noble aims in mind, both have since been sullied by wrongful actions incompatible with their initial missions. This is not to compare the murders of foreign heads of state and overthrow of regimes with the too often too cozy relationship between the K-School, Big Government and Big Donors. But it is cause for concern when the CIA and K-School link up, as it was announced last week they would under the auspices of a new program to be funded by the agency and administered by the K-School.

This relationship raises questions not only because ties between secretive government agencies and academia are inherently troubling, but also because this union is between organizations with checkered pasts. Harvard and the Kennedy School should not have forgotten their liberal natures once again by making an institutional link with a body as reprehensible as the CIA. Under the terms of the agreement, the CIA will fund a \$1.2 million, three-year Kennedy School study assessing the use to which policymakers put the agency's intelligence information. The funding also will pay for special two-week "executive training sessions," presumably modeled after other "executive training sessions" for government officials ranging from bureaucrats in the Education Department to Air Force colonels, that the K-School will hold once a year for senior CIA analysts.

After the deception and secrecy surrounding CIA funding of research projects by Harvard professors Nadav Safran and Samuel P. Huntington, the unprecedented openness of the

new program would seem to justify a suspension of the skepticism that should accompany activities involving the CIA. The CIA is acknowledging itself as the source of funding for a study and has agreed to let the results be published. But by that action the CIA meets only the bare minimum of requirements necessary for any liberal institution.

Doubts must still linger. A CIA analyst will be part of the K-School research team, and his role is as yet undefined. How will he aid such eminent scholars as Professors Richard Neustadt, Ernest May and Gregory Trevorton? Given the inherent tension between a highly secretive, intelligence-gathering branch of the government and a private research institution, the role of this analyst needs to be spelled out so as to prevent abuses of academic freedom that might benefit only the CIA.

The greatest concern must be expressed over the implications of an institutional link between the CIA and Harvard. The CIA, with its secretive nature and its history of undermining the foreign policy aims of our nation's elected representatives—as well as basic international law—should not receive the legitimacy of associating itself with one of the world's leading institutions of liberal education. The recent Iran-contra affair patently showed how the CIA can corrupt U.S. foreign policy.

Harvard most likely could get the money elsewhere if this study is worthwhile. According to spokesmen, the CIA is not giving the researchers any special access. It is unfortunate that the University in its efforts to achieve a small victory for openness linked itself with a body that in its penchant for secrecy has corrupted its noble aim of helping to advance the interests of democracy.

DISSENT

THE MAJORITY opinion is grounded in paranoia about the CIA and ignorance of the agency's history. There are only two ways to object to the CIA-sponsored Kennedy School study. One may argue that the CIA is some kind of an inherently immoral organization—whatever that means—with which Harvard should have no ties. Or one can assert that the University should have no links with the CIA merely because it is an active government agency. The majority opinion wavers between the two arguments, both of which are superficial and don't withstand minimal scrutiny.

Unless one believes that gentlemen shouldn't open each other's mail, it's meaningless to assert that the CIA intrinsically is an immoral body. America, like any other country, needs to gather information about other nations and train analysts to assess the collected data. It's that simple.

And that, simply, is all that the CIA is supposed to do. To call the CIA a "reprehensible" body because of its "secretive" nature and "history of undermining the foreign policy aims of our nation's elected representatives as well as basic international law" is unsupported cant. No such examples are given because there are none to offer.

If the Iran-contra affair showed anything, it wasn't that the "CIA can corrupt U.S. foreign policy." It was that the CIA is a tool that can be misused by the officials who make U.S. foreign policy. To argue otherwise is to forget that our elected leaders control the agency, and that it is they who are responsible for its mistakes.

The other possible argument, that Harvard and its faculty should not be linked with the

CIA simply because it is a government agency, is equally facile. Such links are rampant all over the University. Incredibly, the majority implicitly asserts that it is morally permissible for the K-School to train Defense Department colonels to use nuclear weapons more "effectively" and not for some professors to assess how policy-makers utilize intelligence information.

But the majority cares little for basing its argument on facts or history. Take the conjecture that Harvard could find funding for its study elsewhere. Who says? And while we're asking questions, what does it mean to say Harvard and the Kennedy School have forgotten their "liberal nature"?

Finally, while the role of the CIA analyst who will be part of the research team of course must be greatly circumscribed, as it has been presented the project would seem unobjectionable. The CIA's task is to collect and analyze data and to help maintain American interests abroad. The K-School's mission is to study and help improve the operations of government. It would be foolish to maintain that the CIA has not acted objectionably in the past. But it has done so at the behest of leaders who failed to understand that America's interests abroad almost always fall with those on the side of "democracy." Professors Neustadt, May and Trevorton can only help the CIA do its job of advising America's leaders where the interests of democracy lie.

—Steven Lichtman
—Brooke A. Masters
—Michael D. Nolan
—Gary D. Rowe
—John C. Yoo

THE HARVARD CRIMSON

Wednesday, December 9, 1987